

New Mexico- (Artesia Field Office)
FY 2003 Ranking Criteria Worksheet - Irrigated Cropland

Applicant _____ Farm No. _____ Tract No. _____ CMS Field No's. _____ Date _____
Tribal Land _____ Non-Tribal Land _____ Preliminary Rating _____ Final Rating _____

1. Water Quantity - Maximum Points 60

Irrigation Efficiency - Use FIRS to Evaluate			Potential Points	Benchmark Points	After Points
% Efficiency	% of Area in Contract before Treatment	% of Area in Contract After Treatment			
1-20%			0		
21-30%			5		
31-40%			10		
41-50%			15		
51-60%			25		
61-70%			40		
71-80%			50		
>80%			60		
1. Water Quantity			Total		

2. Water Quality - Maximum Points 40

A. Surface Water Pollutants - Maximum Points 20

There is a probability that runoff water from irrigated fields contains sediment, salt, pesticides, and/or nutrients (or other associated chemicals). Treatment is needed to prevent these pollutants from entering live waters, or re-entering a shared irrigation system. Points will be awarded based on distance from the end of field to the nearest live waters or re-entry point into a shared irrigation system. If there is no run-off, after points will be 0.

Distance of Surface Run-Off to Live Water	Points		Points
<100 Ft.	20		
101 - 500 Ft.	15		
501 - 1,320 Ft.	10		
1,320 - 2,640 Ft.	5		
>2,640 Ft.	0		
A. Surface Water		Total	

B. Ground Water Pollutants - Maximum Points 20

There is a probability that irrigation water containing salt, pesticides, and/or nutrients (or other associated chemicals) is leaching into the ground water. Treatment is needed to prevent these pollutants from contaminating ground water, through leaching and direct return flow into wells. Points to be awarded based on depth to the water table, or elimination of any direct discharge to ground water (regardless of depth to water table).

Depth to Water Table	Points		Points
1 - 15 Ft or elimination of any direct discharge into ground water.	20		
15 - 50 Ft.	10		
50 - 100 Ft.	5		
>100 Ft.	0		
B. Ground Water		Total	

New Mexico- (Artesia Field Office)
FY 2003 Ranking Criteria Worksheet - Irrigated Cropland

Applicant _____ Farm No. _____ Tract No. _____ CMS Field No's. _____ Date _____

Tribal Land _____ Non-Tribal Land _____ Preliminary Rating _____ Final Rating _____

3. Selected Conservation Practice(s) - Maximum Points 80

Any practice used in the ranking criteria and intended to be included in the conservation plan of operations must be cost-shared or have an incentive payment. Higher priority (value) should be given to those practices which address multiple resource concerns, are cost effective, and have longer life spans. Use the Quality Criteria in the FOTG to establish the practices that have an impact on the identified resource concern. Some example practices are listed below:	Potential Points	Percent of need to be installed.	Points
Soil Erosion			
Irrigation system (LESA, LEPA) -442	10		
Irrigation system (Drip) -441	15		
Irrigation land leveling - 464	10		
Irrigation pipeline - 430	5		
Water Quality			
Chemigation valve - 587	5		
Water Quantity			
Irrigation system (LESA, LEPA) - 442	10		
Irrigation system (Drip) - 441	15		
Irrigation land leveling - 464	10		
Irrigation pipeline - 430	5		
Air			
Plants			
Animal			
3. Selected Conservation Practices	Total		

4. Other Considerations - Maximum Points 20

Below are some suggested, not required, criteria. If there are other criteria the D.C. wants to recommend based on LWG advice, please include them here.	Potential Points		Points
A. At risk species are in the area and the contract will enhance habitat for the species.	5		
C. Producer actively controls (NMDA listed) noxious weeds.	10		
D. This land is within a 303d listed stream segment.	5		
4. Other Considerations	Total		

	Water Quantity Water Quality Conservation Practices Other Considerations	Total Points
Designated Conservationist _____	Date _____	